

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	· FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/042,286		01/11/2002	Franciscus J.M. Derks	P 283274 D1169	4594
909	759	0 04/28/2003	•		
		VINTHROP, LLP	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 10500 MCLEAN, VA 22102				SHORT, PATRICIA A	
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			·	1712	
•			DATE MAILED: 04/28/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



·	Application No. /0/042 286	Applicant(s) Derks et al				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Group Art Unit				
	Short	1712				
—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet be	eneath the correspondence address—				
Period f r Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	EXPIRE One	MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE				
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.15 from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, ex Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute 	within the statutory minimiprie SIX (6) MONTHS from	um of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. I the mailing date of this communication .				
Status						
Responsive to communication(s) filed on April	•					
☐ This action is FINAL.						
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935						
Disp sition of Claims						
Claim(s) 1-25	is/are pending in the application.					
Of the above claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
☐ Claim(s)	is/are allowed.					
☐ Claim(s)	is/are rejected.					
□ Claim(s)	is/are objected to.					
☐ Claim(s)	are subject to restriction or election					
Application Papers		requirement.				
☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing	Review, PTO-948.					
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.						
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Examiner.						
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)						
 □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d). □ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been □ received. □ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number)						
received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).						
*Certified copies not received:	Andrew Control	•				
Attachment(s)						
☐ Information Disclosure Stat ment(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s) 🗆 lr	nterview Summary, PTO-413				
☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892		otice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152				
□ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Revi w, PTO-948		Oth r				
Office Acti n Summary						

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 9-97)

Part of Paper No.

Art Unit: 1712

Claims 1-25 are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising species for the component that are 3-ethyl-3-hydroxymethyl-oxetane, 3-methyl-3-hydroxymethyl-oxetane, trialkyl ortho formate, trialkyl ortho acetate and neopentylglycol. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Claims 1-25 are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising species for the additional component that are β-hydroxyl forming component, an amine component and a carbodimide component. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Claims 1-25 are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising species for the ester of (meth)acrylic acid that are polyester and polyalkyd. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the

Application/Control Number: 10/042,286 Page 3

Art Unit: 1712

examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Claims 1-25 are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising species for the acidic catalyst that are sulfuric acid, phosphoric acid, monoester of sulfuric acid monoester of phosphoric acid, para-toluene sulfonic acid, benzene sulfonic acid, styrene sulfonic acid and methane sulfonic acid. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

P. Short

April 22, 2003

Phone (703) 308-2395

Fax (703) 872-9310

PATRICIA A. SHORT PRIMARY EXAMINER

Popula Short